CalServe Developmental and Sustainable-Institutionalization K-12 Service-Learning Partnerships

Grant Application 2006-09

Funding Provided by the
Corporation for National and Community Service
Learn and Serve America

Due May 1, 2006

Counseling, Student Support, and Service-Learning Office
California Department of Education

1430 N Street, Suite 6408
Sacramento, CA 95814-5901
e-mail: *kwickham@cde.ca.gov*
Fax: (916) 319-323-6061
Phone: (916) 319-0719

Contents

2006-09 CalServe Initiative Partnership Grant Guidelines

What Is CalServe?

The CalServe Initiative was developed by the California Department of Education (CDE) in response to the National and Community Service Act of 1990 and has funded kindergarten through twelfth grade service-learning partnerships since 1992.

CalServe Initiative Partnerships provide opportunities for kindergarten through twelfth grade students to participate in quality service-learning experiences that address community needs and enhance academic learning.

Service-learning, as defined by the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS), is a teaching strategy for engaging students in active learning, using higher-order critical thinking skills, and emphasizing the ethics of citizenship and active civic participation.

The Federal Definition of Service-Learning

The term "service-learning" means a method—

A. under which students or participants learn and develop through active participation in thoughtfully organized service that—
  i. is conducted in and meets the needs of a community;
  ii. is coordinated with an elementary school, secondary school, institution of higher education, or community service program, and with the community; and
  iii. helps foster civic responsibility; and

B. **i.** is integrated into and enhances the [core] academic curriculum of the students, or the educational components of the community service program in which the participants are enrolled; and
  ii. provides structured time for the students or participants to reflect on the service experience.

—*Title 42 United States Code* (annotated), Volume 10401-12700, Chapter 23, Section 12511, *1995.*

The purpose of this Request for Applications is to institutionalize service-learning. Each Sustainable-Institutionalization (SI) applicant is asked to focus on how high-quality service-learning will become institutionalized in the school district or consortium and extend service-learning to all schools within each grade span by 2009. Each grantee is expected to sustain the institutionalized high-quality service-learning program after the CalServe grant ends.

Letter of Intent

Local educational agencies (LEAs) interested in submitting grant applications should send a Letter of Intent (page 21) by **February 27, 2006**. A statement of intent is not a binding agreement but will assist the CDE in planning the application review process.

Grant Information and Criteria for Funding

Developmental Partnership

To advance service-learning within California's schools and communities, applicants should demonstrate a commitment to ultimately establish a districtwide or multiple district service-learning initiative. For this application, each applicant needs to ensure that a process and policy are in place so that every student will engage in at least one service-learning experience during each grade span (kindergarten through fifth, sixth through eighth, and ninth through twelfth). There are four stipulations to the developmental grant application acceptance:

1. A single districtwide developmental partnership applicant may not have been a previous CalServe partnership grantee within the last six years.

2. LEAs (school districts or county offices of education) may apply on behalf of a service-learning initiative partnership among a cluster of two or more school districts.

3. A multiple-district consortium applicant should not have a school district in the consortium that has been a previous CalServe partnership grantee within the last six years this will cause the applicant to be ineligible. (see Attachment C)

4. CalServe Regional Network Leads may submit applications as part of a Developmental Partnership Consortium.

Note: CDE will consider funding (1) regions or clusters in very large school districts and (2) direct funded charter schools.

Sustainable-Institutionalization Partnership

Grants will provide existing developmental partnerships of districts or consortia and their community partners with the opportunity to expand their service-learning initiative to a districtwide or consortia-wide service-learning initiative. The initiative must focus on the State Superintendent of Public Instruction's goal of offering all students in the school district(s) at least one service-learning opportunity at each grade span (kindergarten through fifth, sixth through eighth, and ninth through twelfth). The decision to submit an application must be based upon a serious commitment from the LEA and its community partners to build on the existing service-learning initiative and become fully sustainable-institutionalized by 2009. Because the LEA is the only applicant eligible to apply for kindergarten through twelfth grade CalServe funding, the LEA must serve as the fiscal agent for the grant.

Both Developmental and Sustainable-Institutionalization Partnership

Federal regulations require that partnerships must include at least one public or private nonprofit community-based organization that has demonstrated expertise in meeting educational, environmental, public safety, health, and human needs. In addition, the community-based organization must have been in existence for at least one year before applying and must make service opportunities available to student participants.

In addition to community-based organizations, the LEA is strongly encouraged to develop this application in collaboration with parents/families and other members of the local school community to ensure that the service-learning initiative is comprehensive, age-appropriate, and sensitive to cultural and community needs and interests. The partnership is also encouraged to expand its current initiative to include public and private schools, institutions of higher education, county offices of education, parents/families, local community members, private businesses, local government, media, community-based service organizations, other CNCS grantees, and state and federal programs.

Statement of Federal Contingency

Since CalServe is funded by CNCS, availability of funds and program regulations (which include program match requirements and data collection) are contingent on any changes made in the federal legislation or budget. Successful applicants will be subject to programmatic or financial modifications required by federal or state law.

Grant Overview

The funding amount for 2006-09 for each Developmental Partnership may range from $40,000 to $100,000 per year, and the required match will be at least 10 percent of the total program budget for 2005-06 and an increase of 10 percent match per year for the next two years. The award amount is contingent upon the total student enrollment of the LEA or the consortium of school districts. SI Partnerships will remain at the same level as in 2005-06, and the required match will be at least 60 percent of the total program budget for 2005-06 and an increase of 10 percent match per year for the next two years. The funding period for this grant will be September 1, 2006, through August 31, 2009.

Criteria for Funding

Satisfactory Progress

Funding for the three-year period (2006-09) is not automatic but contingent upon availability of funds and satisfactory performance in achieving the outcome indicators described in the LEA's annual grant application.

CalServe will base decisions on the continued funding of SI Partnerships on the quality of their 2006-09 SI application, the January 2006 Semi-Annual Report, the 2004-05 Local Evaluation Report, and information obtained through other sources

4

such as site visits. If there are issues or questions regarding the application, your CalServe liaison will seek clarification from the partnership coordinator and attempt to negotiate a resolution.

Notification of 2006-09 Grant Award

CalServe intends to notify partnerships of grants on or before August 2006. During the summer, partnership coordinators may be asked to provide additional information to their CDE CalServe liaison in order to have a complete application. Please provide a summer contact address, telephone number, and e-mail address for the partnership coordinator or someone familiar with the application.

CalServe Coordinators' Meeting and CalServe Leadership Institute

CalServe requires each partnership grantee to identify a person who will oversee the grant and day-to-day activities (partnership coordinator), and each service-learning partnership coordinator must attend at least two statewide CalServe meetings each year. A coordinators' meeting is tentatively scheduled for October 2006 in northern California. The annual CalServe Leadership Institute is scheduled for March 2007. Each partnership grantee is expected to bring a team of five members to the annual Leadership Institute event and should include funding for travel expenses associated with these meetings in the budget and budget narrative.

Reporting Requirements

Grantees must comply with state and federal reporting requirements. Requirements include a semi-annual progress report in January, a mid-year financial report in March, and an annual application for each year of the grant. Federal requirements include an annual data report to Learn and Serve America (LSA), known as Learn and Serve America Self-Improvement Evaluation (LASSIE), on the number of student participants, grade levels, hours of service, number of participating schools, etc. Grantees must submit the LASSIE report by **June 30, 2007** using LSA's Online Project Description Form.

Local Evaluation and State Evaluation

Partnerships must provide an end-of-year local evaluation report that is based upon the Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan (Form E) and includes data and results on the outcome indicators of service-learning for students, teachers, schools, districts, and communities. Partnerships must also be willing to participate in state-sponsored evaluations to determine the impact of service-learning on students, schools, and communities.

Categorical Programs Monitoring (prior CCR Process)

Partnerships will participate in the CDE's Compliance Programs Monitoring (CPM). Applicants should check with their district's CPM coordinator to determine the district's review cycle status.

Assistance to the State

All CalServe partnerships are expected to promote and advance service-learning. Some possible activities may include co-facilitating workshops and presentations with CalServe staff and sharing knowledge and resources with other school-community partnerships that do not receive CalServe funds.

Participation in Regional Service-Learning Network Activities

Each partnership is required to participate in and support the activities of its Regional Service-Learning Network. Depending on the partnership's level of experience, participation and support may entail attending meetings and activities, facilitating discussions and making presentations on service-learning at events, or assuming an active leadership role in its region.

Initial Screening and Disqualification Criteria

The CDE will screen applications for completeness. The CDE reserves the right to disqualify applications that are not complete or do not include complete budget information. Applicants should follow the instructions described in the Request for Application (RFA) regarding the font size and margin width. Applications that disregard the instructions on number of pages as described in the RFA will be marked with a red line where the application should have ended. Readers will not read beyond the red line. Added attachments beyond those permitted by the RFA will also be ignored by the reviewers.

Reading and Scoring Process

State and local representatives will serve as application readers who will review and score the applications. All readers will receive special training in the scoring process and scoring rubric. The scoring process has been designed to enhance inter-rater reliability and to prevent conflicts of interest. All readers agree not to score any application from a school district or county office in which they are currently working or have worked, consulted on the application, or had any connection that is or might appear to be a conflict of interest. Applicants should, therefore, assume that the reader has no familiarity with individual schools, districts, or community-based agencies or programs. Readers will agree not to discuss the applications they score except under specific circumstances designated as part of the scoring process.

Each application will be read and scored by two readers. Each reader will score the application independently. The two readers will then discuss the application and jointly write comments. If the two scores are identical or if the difference of the two scores falls within a predetermined discrepancy limit, the scores will be considered to be "in agreement" and will be officially recorded. If the difference of the two readers' scores exceeds the discrepancy limit, the application will be read and scored by a third reader.

Interview Process

After the reading process is complete, successful applicants may be asked to participate in an interview. The applicant is expected to send a team of up to five key planners who will be responsible for ensuring that the proposed service-learning activities will be successfully implemented.

Interviews are tentatively planned for May through June 2006. Eligible applicants will be contacted and provided with more details. The scores from both the reading process and interview will be combined to obtain a final score.

Final Selection Process

Final selection will be based in part on a distribution of urban, rural, suburban LEAs and a geographic balance of the state.

Appeal Process

Applicants who wish to appeal the grant award decision regarding their application must submit a letter directed to Wade Brynelson no later than **July 21, 2006,** at the following address:

<div align="center">

Wade S. Brynelson, Administrator
Counseling, Student Support, and Service-Learning Office
California Department of Education
1430 N Street, Suite 6408
Sacramento, CA 95814-5901

</div>

Before submitting a letter of appeal, applicants should conduct an in-depth evaluation of the application against the scoring rubric. The appeal letter must describe the factors that caused the applicant to conclude that the readers and, if applicable, interviewers did not follow the prescribed scoring rubric and explain why the score is in conflict with the rubric or the grant award process described in the RFA. The letter should also include specific information taken from the application or the interview that the applicant believes was overlooked or misinterpreted.

If the appeal letter justifies the need, the application will be reviewed by CDE staff or designees. The director of the Learning Support and Partnerships Division will make the final decision to revise the original score of an application and to fund the application. Each situation will be handled on an individual basis and will be contingent upon the availability of funding.

Technical Assistance

Technical assistance will be provided at seven regional RFA outreach sessions during the week of February 3 through 10, 2006. Times and locations will be posted on the CalServe Web site at *http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/r8/calserve06ta.asp*. Visit the CalServe Web site or contact the CalServe consultants for additional assistance: Mike Brugh at *mbrugh@cde.ca.gov* or (916) 319-0543; or Terry Shorey at *tshorey@cde.ca.gov* or (916) 319-0227.

Developmental Partnership Funding Terms and Conditions

In 2006-07, the CDE CalServe Initiative anticipates receiving approximately $2.2 million from the CNCS. Of that amount, approximately $600,000 will be made available to support Developmental Partnerships.

Developmental Partnership Funding (Examples)

Calserve Funding 06-07	Percent Match For 2006-07	Partnership Size Based on ADA	Minimum Local Match Based On The "Total" Program Budget	Total 2006-07 Program Budget
$30,000	10%	Up to 2,500 students	$3,333.34	$33,333.34
$50,000	10%	2,501-10,000 students	$5,555.56	$55,555.56
$80,000	10%	10,001-25,000 students	$8,888.89	$88,888.89
$100,000	10%	Over 25,000 students	$11,111.12	$111,111.12

Use of Funding

- Local partnerships may budget no more than 2.5 percent of their grant funds for indirect costs. The CNCS allows the state to use no more than 5 percent of the CNCS grant for indirect costs, and that percentage is shared between the CDE and the participating LEAs.

- Stipends, allowances, or other financial support may *not* be paid to any kindergarten through twelfth grade student participant except as reimbursement for transportation, meals, and other reasonable out-of-pocket expenses directly related to program participation. Minor expenses for identification of service-learning participants or recognition of excellent or outstanding participant service are allowed.

- CalServe grant funds may *not* be used to pay for food or refreshments other than those associated with travel to service-learning activities included in this application.

- Adequate funds should be budgeted to support participation in one CalServe Coordinators' meeting and the CalServe Leadership Institute (see page 4).

- At least 10 percent of the grant award amount must be set aside for evaluation and program quality assurance (see Form E).

General Assurances

The CDE's general assurances required for grants supported by state or federal funds can be found at *http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/fm/genassur.asp.*

Developmental Partnership Application Due Date and Delivery Instructions

Please mail one **original** hard copy of your application to the following address postmarked on or before **May 1, 2006**:

> Counseling, Student Support, and Service-Learning
> California Department of Education
> 1430 N Street, Suite 6408
> Sacramento, CA 95814-5901

Please e-mail one electronic copy to *kwickham@cde.ca.gov*, by **May 1, 2006**.

Application Narrative: Developmental Partnership Applicants

The Application Narrative must be no more than **ten pages double-spaced**.

Please address the following six items in the Application Narrative:

1. Vision and Policy

a. Describe the local education agency's (LEA's) short-range and long-range institutionalization goals and plans. Provide details of how service-learning is tied formally and purposefully to other important, high-profile efforts in the school district (e.g., administrator training, community partnership efforts, improvement of teaching, and student achievement).

b. State the partnership's long-term vision for service-learning. Describe how this vision is consistent with CalServe's goal of having school districts provide one service-learning experience at each grade span for all students, as indicated on Form E (Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan), Section 1 (Vision and Policy).

c. Describe any critical issues or challenges the partnership has faced implementing service-learning and how you plan to overcome these challenges next year, as indicated on Form E (Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan).

d. Describe current local board policies or administrative directives in support of institutionalizing service-learning that have been established or are in development, as indicated on Form E (Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan), Section 1 (Vision and Policy).

e. Describe the partnership's major milestones of next year's work to achieve the long-term vision policy goals for institutionalizing in the LEA's service-learning by 2009.

f. Using Form E (Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan), complete the section for Vision and Policy using the outcomes provided in the form.

2. High-Quality Service-Learning

a. Based on the district's vision for service-learning and an analysis of current school, district, and community needs and capacities, describe how high-quality service-learning has been integrated into key areas of the district's instructional practice and will be expanded in next year's plans. Describe your plan for achieving a minimum of 20 hours of service-learning experience per semester for each participating student.

b. How will the partnership use embedded assessment to test student achievement of academic content standards and civic responsibility linking history, civics, and service? Describe how your partnership will use the Youth Service California Service-Learning Dipstick at *http://www.yscal.org/resources/assets/Dipsticks.pdf*, Forty Developmental Assets at *http://www.search-institute.org/assets/*, the RMC Research Corporation Sustainability Index at *http://www.rmcdenver.com/sub3.asp?xid=3&hti=Civic-Engagement.jpg&sdc=0066a8*, or other tools to ensure that service-learning activities align with the five elements of the federal definition for service-learning.

c. How will young people have a voice in determining community needs and service activities?

d. How will your initiative include opportunities for students from public and nonpublic schools and from diverse groups as to age, race, gender, ethnicity, ability, and economic background to serve and study together?

e. Describe your strategies for engaging disadvantaged youths in your service-learning initiative. Report on the effectiveness of these strategies.

f. Using Form E (Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan), complete the section for High-Quality Service-Learning.

3. Training and Professional Development

a. Based on a needs assessment and recommendations from the local advisory committee, describe how the partnership will implement the professional development plan. If new training needs have been identified, describe how they were identified and if they were met. SI applicants should use recommendations presented in the local evaluation report. The Training and Professional Development Plan should include opportunities for private and nonpublic school teachers to attend.

b. How will youths, parents, and community partners become involved in the planning and participation in these events?

c. Describe how the partnership will integrate service-learning into staff development activities provided by other programs in the district and/or the community.

d. Using Form E (Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan), complete the section for Training and Professional Development.

4. Organizational Design and Leadership Capacity

   a. Describe the partnership's (LEA and community) leadership and school site coordination structure and the effectiveness of this structure.

   b. List specific examples of how the partnership's advisory committee has provided or will provide leadership, support, and resources. How will the role of youth leadership in the district be included? Describe how youths were participants in this application.

   c. How will the partnership's leadership and organizational structure be expanded or changed in 2006-07? What new district and community partners will be added and what role will they play? Describe how the partnership will build replicability.

   d. Using Form D (Summary of Proposed Key Activities During 2006-09), list next year's proposed events and activities.

   e. Using Form E (Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan), complete the section for Organizational Design and Leadership Capacity.

5. Resource Development and Public Relations/Recognition Activities

   a. Describe your current funding (both cash and in-kind) and resource development strategies, such as collaborating with community agencies or institutions of higher education and forming linkages to other district or county initiatives.

   b. Describe next year's plans to develop your partnership's funding and resource capacity.

   c. Describe next year's communication plans for public relations, marketing, recognition activities, and how youths and community members will be involved in the planning process.

   d. Using Form E (Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan), complete the section for Resource Development and Public Relations/Recognition Activities.

6. Evaluation, Accountability, and Continuous Program Improvement

The primary purpose of the local evaluation should be to inform the school board and the district advisory committee as they guide and promote the efforts of the partnership. The evaluation process should be led by a local evaluation team and focus on two key areas: (1) the benefits of service-learning for students, teachers, schools, and community; and (2) the monitoring of progress toward districtwide implementation of service-learning. Both of these areas are critical to the integration of service-learning into the culture of a school community.

   a. Describe your local evaluation team, the membership, roles, and responsibilities for 2006-07.

   b. Present an overview of the 2006-07 evaluation process that describes linkages to established district and/or community evaluation mechanisms and the resources involved in completing the evaluation process.

   c. Describe any prior evaluation data and how they have been used to improve the quality of service-learning, inform policy, and garner support for service-learning.

d. Using Form E (Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan), complete the section for Evaluation, Accountability, and Continuous Program Improvement.

e. Using Form F (Service-Learning Participant Data), indicate the number of individuals and organizations involved in your partnership.

Service-Learning Initiative Developmental Partnership Forms

Form A: CalServe Initiative Partnership Grant Application 2006-09 Cover Page

Please complete this form, and have it signed by your superintendent or designee.

Form B-2: Developmental Partnership 2006-07 Budget

Before completing the budget, please review Funding Terms and Conditions. "Other" contributions may be cash or in-kind, such as services and facilities (with a dollar value assigned). Applicants may use private, local, state, or federal funds (other than CNCS funds) or in-kind resources for the match requirement. Program (nonadministrative) costs include certificated or non certificated personnel for program coordination, and other costs directly attributed to the implementation of the service-learning initiative. Claims for local indirect costs may not exceed 2.5 percent. The difference between the LEA's standard indirect cost rate and the allowed 2.5 percent may be considered part of the local match requirement.

Budget Narrative

The Budget Narrative must not exceed **three pages, single-spaced**. Use the narrative to justify how the proposed budget expenditures will support high-quality, cost-effective service-learning activities described in the application narrative. The budget should not contain unexplained amounts for miscellaneous or contingency costs or unallowable line items such as student stipends or refreshments (see page 7, Use of Funding). The narrative should describe the basis used to estimate the total costs for each line item and describe how each budget line item from Form B-2 relates to the proposed program. Please provide specific information regarding roles, time base, salary of staff and consultants, and a clear description of services to be purchased. The budget should demonstrate evidence of, or ability to secure, the required match (10 percent for Developmental Partnerships) during 2006-07 for total program costs (total includes match). In addition, provide a brief description of non-CalServe funds and in-kind resources being used to support the kindergarten through twelfth grade service-learning initiative.

For 2006-07, include a detailed plan for each of the forms below. For 2007-09, include major milestones for the forms below**.**

Form C: Not Required for New Developmental Partnership Applicants

Form D: Summary of Proposed Key Activities During 2006-09

Provide a summary of the key activities described in your narrative and events that are representative of the grant. The purpose of the summary is to help the reviewers quickly understand the structure of the proposed initiative.

Form E: Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan

Provide an evaluation plan that describes the kinds of evidence, strategies, and personnel that will document and report results of the end and intermediate outcomes described in each of the application narrative sections.

Form F: CalServe Participant Data

Provide the CDE with the size and scope of the proposed CalServe Partnership. Estimate the number of participants and schools that will be involved in the proposed partnership during 2006-07.

CalServe Partnership Abstract (Between 350 and 500 Words Total)

Your CalServe Partnership abstract will appear on CalServe's Web site and should target an audience that is unfamiliar with the demographics or other aspects of your partnership. Abstracts must be between only 350 and 500 words in total length. Please include a short paragraph on each of the following items to appear in this order:

- **Name and Overview**: Your LEA/partnership name and a brief statement about the demographic and geographic characteristics of your district.

- **Vision and Policy**: An overall description of your LEA's vision and status of school board policy development for service-learning.

- **Service-Learning Activities**: Brief descriptions of the kinds of service-learning activities and focus areas found in the LEA.

- **Community Partnerships**: Description of key community partners' roles in supporting your efforts.

- **Organizational Strategies**: Description of innovative LEA and community organizational strategies that make service-learning work.

- **Web Site**: If you have a Web site, please include the address so that the CDE may establish a link from CalServe's Web site at *http://www.cde.ca.gov/cr/sl*.

Service-Learning Initiative Sustainable-Institutionalization Applicant Instructions

Sustainable-Institutionalization Partnership Funding Terms and Conditions

In 2006-07, the CDE CalServe Initiative anticipates receiving approximately $2.2 million from the CNCS, LSA. Of that amount, approximately $600,000 will be made available to SI Partnerships. Please keep in mind that CalServe has not received a grant award notification and, as such, the figures below should be used only for preliminary planning purposes.

LEA Qualifications and Sustainable-Institutionalization Partnership Funding

Partnerships eligible to apply in the SI category are LEAs that:

1. Have been a CalServe partnership during the 2003-2006 grant cycle.

2. Have demonstrated success working in a coordinated, strategic manner to provide effective service-learning opportunities for school-age youths within a school district or consortium of school districts with CalServe funding.

3. Have completed all required CalServe reports in a timely manner. This includes semi-annual progress reports, mid-year financial reports, annual renewal applications, and local evaluation reports.

4. Are committed to establishing a fully sustainable-institutionalized consortium-wide or districtwide service-learning initiative by 2006 that will provide every student with least one service-learning experience at each grade span (kindergarten through fifth, sixth through eighth, and ninth through twelfth).

Sustainable-Institutionalization Partnership Funding (Examples)

CalServe Funding 2006-07	Percent Match for 2006-07	Minimum Local Match based on the "Total" Program Budget	Total 2006-07 Program Budget
$30,000	60%	$45,000	$75,000
$50,000	60%	$75,000	$125,000
$80,000	60%	$120,000	$200,000
$100,000	60%	$150,000	$250,000

Funding

- Local partnerships may budget no more than 2.5 percent of their grant funds for indirect costs. The CNCS allows the state to use no more than 5 percent of the CNCS grant for indirect costs, and that percentage is shared between the CDE and the participating LEAs.

- Stipends, allowances, or other financial support may *not* be paid to any kindergarten through twelfth grade student participant except as reimbursement for transportation, meals, and other reasonable out-of-pocket expenses directly related to program participation. Minor expenses for identification of service-learning participants or recognition of excellent or outstanding participant service are allowed.

- Eligible LEAs may apply for up to the same amount of funding they received in 2005-06

- CalServe grant funds may *not* be used to pay for food or refreshments other than those associated with travel to service-learning activities included in this application.

- Adequate funds should be budgeted to support participation in one CalServe Coordinators' meeting and the CalServe Leadership Institute (see page 4).

- At least 10 percent of the grant award amount must be set aside for evaluation and program quality assurance (see Form E).

General Assurances

The CDE's general assurances required for grants supported by state or federal funds can be found at *http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/fm/genassur.asp.*

Sustainable–Institutionalization Application Due Date and Delivery Instructions
Please mail one **original** hard copy of your application to the following address postmarked on or before **May 1, 2006**:

<div align="center">

Counseling, Student Support, and Service-Learning
California Department of Education
1430 N Street, Suite 6408
Sacramento, CA 95814-5901

</div>

Please e-mail one electronic copy to *kwickham@cde.ca.gov*, by **May 1, 2006**.

Application Narrative: Sustainable–Institutionalization Partnership applicants

The Application Narrative must be no more than **ten pages double-spaced**.

The SI Partnership applicants must include a discussion of both progress to date and next year's plan for each item below. The time period for the Progress-to-Date narrative is January 1, 2006, through June 30, 2006. Prior to completing this narrative, review your original application submitted to CalServe in March 2003, the Semi-Annual Report submitted in January 2006, the 2004-05 Local Evaluation Plan, and complete the CalServe Partnership Sustainability Continuum
(Attachment A).

The SI Partnership should estimate your June 1, 2006, through August 31, 2006 items. The time period for next year's plan is September 1, 2006, through August 31, 2007.

Please address the following seven items in the Application Narrative:

1. Vision and Policy

    a. Describe the local education agency's short-range and long-range institutionalization goals and plans. Provide details of how service-learning is tied formally and purposefully to other important, high-profile efforts in the school district (e.g., administrator training, community partnership efforts, improvement of teaching, and student achievement).

    b. The partnership's vision for service-learning must result in the school district providing at least one service-learning experience at each grade span for all students. Please provide an overview of how this vision will be achieved at the end of year three, as indicated on Form E (Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan), Section 1 (Vision and Policy).

    c. Describe any critical issues or challenges the partnership has faced implementing service-learning and how you plan to overcome these challenges next year as indicated in Form E (Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan).

    d. Describe current local board policies or administrative directives in support of institutionalizing service-learning that have been established or are in development, as indicated on Form E (Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan), Section 1 (Vision and Policy).

    e. Describe the partnership's major milestones of next year's work to achieve the long-term vision policy goals for institutionalizing service-learning by 2009, as indicated on Form E (Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan).

    f. Using Form E (Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan), complete the section for Vision and Policy, using the outcomes provided on the form.

2. High-Quality Service-Learning

    a. Based on the district's vision for service-learning and an analysis of current school, district, and community needs and capacities, describe how high-quality service-learning has been integrated into key areas of the district's instructional practice and will be expanded in next year's plans. Describe your plan for achieving a minimum of 20 hours per semester of service-learning experience for each participating student.

    b. How will the partnership use embedded assessment to test student achievement of academic content standards and civic responsibility linking history, civics, and service? Describe how your partnership will use the Youth Service California Service-Learning Dipstick at *http://www.yscal.org/resources/assets/Dipsticks.pdf*, Forty Developmental Assets at *http://www.search-institute.org/assets/*, the RMC Research Corporation Sustainability Index at *http://www.rmcdenver.com/sub3.asp?xid=3&hti=Civic-Engagement.jpg&sdc=0066a8*, or other tools to ensure that service-learning activities align with the five elements of the federal definition for service-learning.

    c. How will young people have a voice in determining community needs and service activities?

d. How will your initiative include opportunities for students from public and nonpublic schools and from diverse groups as to age, race, gender, ethnicity, ability, and economic background to serve and study together?

e. Describe your strategies for engaging and funding disadvantaged youths in your service-learning initiative.

f. Using Form E (Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan), complete the section for High-Quality Service-Learning.

3. Training and Professional Development

a. Based on a needs assessment and recommendations from the local advisory committee, describe how the partnership will implement the professional development plan. If new training needs have been identified, describe how they were identified and if they were met. The SI applicants should use recommendations presented in the local evaluation report. The Training and Professional Development Plan should include opportunities for private and nonpublic school teachers to attend.

b. How will youths, parents, and community partners become involved in the planning and participation in these events?

c. Describe how the partnership will integrate service-learning into staff development activities provided by other programs in the district and/or the community.

d. Using Form C (Summary of 2005-06 SI Partnership Applicant's Professional Development Activities and Conference/Workshop Presentations), list activities and conference presentations that will occur between January 1, 2006, and August 31, 2006.

e. Using Form E (Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan), complete the section for Training and Professional Development.

4. Organizational Design and Leadership Capacity

a. Describe the partnership's (LEA and community) leadership and school site coordination structure and the effectiveness of this structure. Applicants should explain changes from the 2005-06 application.

b. List specific examples of how the partnership's advisory committee has provided or will provide leadership, support, and resources. How will the role of youth leadership in the district be expanded next year? Describe how youths were participants in this application.

c. How will the partnership's leadership and organizational structure be expanded or changed in 2006-07? What new district and community partners will be added and what role will they play? Describe how the partnership will build replicability.

d. Using Form D (Summary of Proposed Key Activities During 2006-09), list next year's proposed events and activities.

e. Using Form E (Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan), complete the section for Organizational Design and Leadership Capacity.

5. Resource Development and Public Relations/Recognition Activities

a. Describe your current funding (both cash and in-kind) and resource development strategies, such as collaborating with community agencies or institutions of higher education and forming linkages to other district or county initiatives.

b. Describe next year's plans to expand your partnership's funding and resource capacity.

c. Describe next year's communication plans for public relations, marketing, recognition activities, and how youth and community members will be involved in the planning process.

d. Using Form E (Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan), complete the section for Resource Development and Public Relations/Recognition Activities.

6. Evaluation, Accountability, and Continuous Program Improvement

The primary purpose of the local evaluation should be to inform the school board and the district advisory committee as they guide and promote the efforts of the partnership. The evaluation process should be led by a local evaluation team and focus on two key areas: (1) the benefits of service-learning for students, teachers, schools, and community; and (2) the monitoring of progress toward districtwide implementation of service-learning. Both of these areas are critical to the integration of service-learning into the culture of a school community.

a. Describe your local evaluation team, the membership, roles, and responsibilities for 2006-07. Also describe the qualifications of the evaluator.

b. Present an overview of the 2006-07 evaluation process that describes linkages to established district and/or community evaluation mechanisms and the resources involved in completing the evaluation process.

c. Describe how the 2004-06 evaluation data have been used to improve the quality of service-learning, inform policy, and garner support for SI. Describe how your partnership's 2006-09 local evaluation report will be used to institutionalize your high-quality service-learning initiative.

d. Using Form E (Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan), complete the section for Evaluation, Accountability, and Continuous Program Improvement.

e. Using Form F (Service-Learning Participant Data), indicate the number of individuals and organizations involved in your partnership.

7. Institutionalizing and Sustaining High-Quality Service-Learning

a. Describe how high-quality service-learning will become institutionalized in your school district or consortium. Provide details of how the LEA will provide fiscal support for a coordinator and for professional development, extend service-learning to all schools within each grade span by 2009, and sustain it after the grant ends.

b. Using Form E (Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan), complete the form for Institutionalizing and Sustaining High-Quality Service-Learning.

Service-Learning Initiative Sustainable–Institutionalization Partnership Forms

Form A: CalServe Initiative Partnership Grant Application 2006-09 Cover Page

Please complete this form and have it signed by your superintendent or designee.

Form B-1: Sustainable–Institutionalization Partnership 2006-07 Budget

Before completing the budget, please review Funding Terms and Conditions. "Other" contributions may be cash or in-kind, such as services and facilities (with a dollar value assigned). Applicants may use private, local, state, or federal funds (other than CNCS funds), or in-kind resources for the match requirement. Program (nonadministrative) costs include certificated or noncertificated personnel for program coordination, and other costs directly attributed to the implementation of the service-learning initiative. Claims for local indirect costs may not exceed 2.5 percent. The difference between the LEA's standard indirect cost rate and the allowed 2.5 percent may be considered part of the local match requirement.

Budget Narrative

The Budget Narrative must not exceed **three pages, single-spaced**. Use the narrative to justify how the proposed budget expenditures will support high-quality, cost-effective service-learning activities described in the application narrative. The budget should not contain unexplained amounts for miscellaneous or contingency costs or unallowable line items such as student stipends or refreshments (see page 13, Use of Funding). The narrative should describe the basis used to estimate the total costs for each line item and how each budget line item from Form B-1 relates to the proposed program. Please provide specific information regarding roles, time base, salary of staff and consultants, and a clear description of services to be purchased. The budget should demonstrate evidence of, or ability to secure, the required match (60 percent for SI Partnerships during 2006-07) for total program costs (total includes match). In addition, provide a brief description of non-CalServe funds and in-kind resources being used to support the kindergarten through twelfth grade service-learning initiative.

For 2006-07, include a detailed plan for each of the forms below. For 2007-09, include major milestones for the forms named below.

Form C: Summary of 2005-06 Sustainable-Institutionalization Partnership Applicant's Professional Development Activities and Conference/Workshop Presentations

Provide a list of activities and conference presentations that have or will have occurred between January 1, 2006, and August 31, 2006.

Form D: Summary of Proposed Key Activities During 2006-09

Provide a summary of the key activities described in your narrative and events that are representative of the grant. The purpose of the summary is to help the reviewers quickly understand the structure of the proposed initiative.

Form E: Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan

Provide an evaluation plan that describes the kinds of evidence, strategies, and personnel that will document and report results of the end and intermediate outcomes described in each of the seven application narrative sections.

Form F: CalServe Partnership Data

Provide the CDE with the size and scope of the proposed CalServe Partnership. Estimate the number of participants and schools that will be involved in the proposed partnership during 2006-07.

CalServe Partnership Abstract (Between 350 and 500 Words Total)

Your CalServe Partnership abstract will appear on CalServe's Web site and should target an audience that is unfamiliar with the demographics or other aspects of your partnership. Abstracts must be between only 350 and 500 words in total length.

Please include a short paragraph on each of the following items to appear in this order:

- **Name and Overview**: Your LEA/partnership name and a brief statement about the demographic and geographic characteristics of your district.

- **Vision and Policy**: An overall description of your LEA's vision and status of school board policy development for service-learning.

- **Service-Learning Activities**: Brief descriptions of the kinds of service-learning activities and focus areas found in the LEA.

- **Community Partnerships**: Description of key community partners' roles in supporting your efforts.

- **Organizational Strategies**: Description of innovative LEA and community organizational strategies that make service-learning work.

- **Web Site**: If you have a Web site, please include the address so that the CDE may establish a link from CalServe's Web site at *http://www.cde.ca.gov/cr/sl*.

CalServe Initiative Partnership
Application Checklist

This checklist helps ensure that your application includes the necessary forms in the required order. The checklist is for the applicant's use and need not be submitted to CalServe.

☐ **Letter of Intent:** Application for 2006-09 CalServe Initiative Funds for Developmental or Sustainable–Institutionalization Partnership Service-Learning Grant Due by February 27, 2006 (not a requirement for application)

All grant applications must contain the following:

☐ **Form A:** CalServe Initiative Partnership Grant Application 2006-09 Cover Page

☐ **Form B-1:** Sustainable-Institutionalization Partnership 2006-07 Budget

☐ **Form B-2:** Developmental Partnership 2006-07 Budget

☐ **Budget Narrative:** Three-page maximum (single-spaced)

☐ **Application Narrative:** Eight-page maximum (double-spaced) including the following components:

- Progress to Date
- Next Year's Plan

☐ **Form C:** Summary of 2005-06 Sustainable-Institutionalization Partnership Applicant's Professional Development Activities and Conference/Workshop Presentations

☐ **Form D:** Summary of Proposed Key Activities During 2006-09

☐ **Form E:** Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan

☐ **Form F:** CalServe Participant Data

☐ **Attachment A:** Sustainable-Institutionalization Continuum for CalServe Partnerships (Self-Review)

☐ **Cal Serve Partnership Abstract:** 500-word maximum

> **Please mail an original hard copy of your application on or before May 1, 2006, and e-mail one copy as a file attachment by May 1, 2006, to *kwickham@cde.ca.gov.***

If you have any questions about the CalServe grant application process, please contact your CalServe liaison at the Counseling, Student Support, and Service-Learning office by e-mail or by phone: Mike Brugh*, mbrugh@cde.ca.gov,* (916) 319-0543; or Terry Shorey, *tshorey@cde.ca.gov*, (916) 319-0227.

Letter of Intent

Application for 2006-09 CalServe Initiative Funds for
Developmental or Sustainable-Institutionalization Partnership
Service-Learning Grant

By returning this Letter of Intent you will inform the CDE that your district or county is planning to apply for a CalServe Developmental Partnership or Sustainable-Institutionalization Partnership grant. This letter of intent must be postmarked no later than **February 27, 2006**, and mailed or faxed to:

Counseling, Student Support, and Service Learning Office
California Department of Education
1430 N Street, Suite 6408
Sacramento, CA 95814-5901
e-mail: *kwickham@cde.ca.gov*
Fax: (916) 319-323-6061

☐ Developmental Partnership   ☐ Sustainable-Institutionalization Partnership

Check one of the boxes above.

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY:		
NAME AND TITLE OF FISCAL CONTACT:		
ADDRESS:	CITY:	ZIP CODE:
TELEPHONE NUMBER:	FAX NUMBER:	
E-MAIL:		

Program Coordinator

NAME AND TITLE OF PROGRAM COORDINATOR:		
ADDRESS:	CITY:	ZIP CODE:
TELEPHONE NUMBER:	FAX NUMBER:	
E-MAIL:		

SUPERINTENDENT'S SIGNATURE	DATE
PROGRAM COORDINATOR'S SIGNATURE	DATE

Form A

CalServe Initiative Partnership
Grant Application 2006-09 Cover Page

☐ Developmental Partnership   ☐ Sustainable-Institutionalization Partnership

Check one of the boxes above.

For the benefit of the public, the educators, the media, the legislators, and other interested parties, CalServe includes information about each partnership on our Web page at *http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/sl*. Please complete this form and note any changes in contact information or leadership for your partnership.

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY (LEA):	COUNTY-DISTRICT CODE:
NAME AND TITLE OF FISCAL CONTACT:	
ADDRESS:	
CITY:	ZIP CODE:
TELEPHONE NUMBER:	FAX NUMBER:
E-MAIL:	WEB SITE:

Program Coordination Contact and Summer Contact

LEA OR ORGANIZATION THAT WILL PROVIDE PROGRAM COORDINATION:	
NAME AND TITLE OF PROGRAM COORDINATOR:	
ADDRESS:	
CITY:	ZIP CODE:
TELEPHONE NUMBER:	FAX NUMBER:
E-MAIL:	
SUMMER CONTACT NAME:	SUMMER CONTACT TELEPHONE NUMBER:
SUMMER CONTACT E-MAIL:	

Signatures/Approvals

Before completing certification, please review the current Policies Related to Certifications and Assurances and Terms of Certifications. California Department of Education (CDE) general assurances required for grants supported by state or federal funds can be found at *http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/fm/genassur.asp*. By signing this page, the applicant certifies that the local educational agency agrees to perform all actions and support all intentions stated in the certifications and assurances.

I hereby certify that all applicable federal rules and regulations will be observed by this applicant; that to the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this application is correct and complete; and that this applicant hereby agrees to have its use of funds reviewed and/or audited according to the standards and criteria set forth in the CDE's Compliance Program Monitoring Manual.

DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT OR DESIGNEE:	SUPERINTENDENT'S OR DESIGNEE'S SIGNATURE/DATE:
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF ORGANIZATION RESPONSIBLE FOR PROGRAM COORDINATOR (IF OTHER THAN THE DISTRICT):	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S SIGNATURE/DATE:
PROGRAM COORDINATOR'S NAME:	PROGRAM COORDINATOR'S SIGNATURE/DATE:

Form B-1

Sustainable-Institutionalization Partnership 2006-07 Budget

On the budget below, indicate expenditures in categories and include up to three pages of Budget Narrative that further detail how these funds will be used and the source of match from the local educational agency and other organizations.

Note: CalServe Sustainable-Institutionalization Partnerships must demonstrate a local match of at least 60 percent of the total program budget (CalServe funds and match). Districts operating CalServe Partnerships are required to report expenditures in accordance with the object classification plan in the *California School Accounting Manual.* The use of these object codes will facilitate the preparation of budgets and the mid-year and year-end financial reports requested by CalServe. This budget page reflects typical service-learning expenditures. For guidelines and requirements on the appropriate use of funding, please refer to the California Department of Education *General Assurances* and Corporation for National Community Service (CNCS) *General Grant Provisions* that are available on the CalServe Web site at *http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/fm/genassur.asp.*

COUNTY-DISTRICT CODE:		LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY:				
AMOUNT REQUESTED:		FISCAL CONTACT PERSON:				
OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE CODES:	CALSERVE LSA K-12	SOURCES OF REQUIRED MATCH AT 10% (CASH OR IN-KIND SERVICE)				BUDGET ITEM TOTAL
		DISTRICT FUNDS *(A.D.A., STATE, OR NON-CNCS FEDERAL CATEGORICAL)*	PUBLIC SECTOR *(E.G., FOREST SERVICE, POLICE DEPARTMENT)*	NONPROFIT *(E.G., COMMUNITY-BASED ORG. OR FOUNDATION)*	PRIVATE SECTOR *(E.G., BUSINESS PARTNER)*	
1000 Certificated Salaries						
2000 Classified Salaries						
3000 Employee Benefits						
4000 Books and Supplies						
5000 Services and other operating expenditures (other than Travel and Evaluation expenditures)						
5200 Travel and conferences (not related to evaluation)						
Evaluation (at least 10% of grant amount) 5100 Consultant contracts 5200 Travel 5800 Other services and operating expenditures						
Total of direct charges above						
Indirect charges (2.5% cap)						
TOTALS	CALSERVE REQUEST					TOTAL PROGRAM BUDGET

Form B-2:

Developmental Partnership 2006-07 Budget

On the budget below, indicate expenditures in categories and include up to three pages of Budget Narrative that further detail how these funds will be used and the source of match from the local educational agency and other organizations.

Note: Year Two CalServe Developmental Partnerships must demonstrate a local match of at least 10 percent of the total program budget (CalServe funds and match). Districts operating CalServe Partnerships are required to report expenditures in accordance with the object classification plan in the *California School Accounting Manual.* The use of these object codes will facilitate the preparation of budgets and the mid-year and year-end financial reports requested by CalServe. This budget page reflects typical service-learning expenditures. For guidelines and requirements on the appropriate use of funding, please refer to the California Department of Education *General Assurances* and Corporation for National Community Service (CNCS) *General Grant Provisions* that are available on the CalServe Web site at *http://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/fo/fm/genassur.asp.*

COUNTY-DISTRICT CODE :		LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY:				
AMOUNT REQUESTED:		FISCAL CONTACT PERSON:				
OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE CODES	CALSERVE LSA K-12	SOURCES OF REQUIRED MATCH AT 60% (CASH OR IN-KIND SERVICE)				BUDGET ITEM TOTAL
		DISTRICT FUNDS *(A.D.A., STATE OR NON-CNCS FEDERAL CATEGORICAL)*	PUBLIC SECTOR *(E.G., FOREST SERVICE, POLICE DEPARTMENT)*	NONPROFIT *(E.G., COMMUNITY-BASED ORG. OR FOUNDATION)*	PRIVATE SECTOR *(E.G., BUSINESS PARTNER)*	
1000 Certificated Salaries						
2000 Classified Salaries						
3000 Employee Benefits						
4000 Books and Supplies						
5000 Services and other operating expenditures (other than Travel and Evaluation expenditures)						
5200 Travel & conferences (not related to evaluation)						
Evaluation (at least 10% of grant amount)						
5100 Consultant contracts						
5200 Travel						
5800 Other services & operating expenditures						
Total of direct charges above						
Indirect charges (2.5% cap)						
TOTAL	CALSERVE REQUEST					TOTAL PROGRAM

Sample
CalServe Developmental Partnership 2006-07 Grant Budget
Budget Format with Ten Percent Match

☐ Developmental Partnership   ☐ Sustainable-Institutionalization Partnership

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY:	COUNTY-DISTRICT CODE:		
AMOUNT REQUESTED:	FISCAL CONTACT PERSON:		
OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE CODES:	CALSERVE LSA K-12	SOURCES OF REQUIRED MATCH AT 10% (CASH OR IN-KIND SERVICE)	BUDGET ITEM TOTAL
1. Personnel (1000-3000) 0.10 FTE for coordinator------------------ 0.10 FTE for coordinator------------------	----------------$33,333 ----------------------------	------------------------$3,704	$37,037
2. Consultants (5000) Stipends to teachers (10 @ $333 each)-------------------- District match (10 @ $333 each)-------	------------------$3,333 ----------------------------	--------------------------$371	$3,704
3. Materials and Supplies (4000) Books and printing------------------------- Kinko's Printing (in-kind donation)------	------------------$3,333 ----------------------------	--------------------------$371	$3,704
4. Travel (5000, 7000) Travel to coordinator meeting and CalServe Leadership Institute-----------	------------------$2,500	--------------------------$278	$2,778
5. Communications (5000) Phone and Mailing------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------$3,333	$3,333
6. Training Activities (5000, 7000) Three teacher workshops facilities------	------------------$6,283	--------------------------$699	$6,982
7. Administrative Indirect (7300) 2.5% cap---------------------------------- Administrative match----------------------	------------------$1,217 (2.5%)	------------------------$136	$1,353
TOTALS	**$49,999**	**$8,892**	**TOTAL PROGRAM BUDGET** **$58,891**

28

Form C (Sustainable-Institutionalization applicants only)

Summary of 2005-06 Sustainable-Institutionalization Partnership Applicant's Professional Development Activities and Conference/Workshop Presentations

Please use this form to list key professional development activities and conference/workshop presentations that will be conducted between January 1, 2006, and August 31, 2006. Also indicate the number and type of individuals involved.

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY:	PERSON COMPLETING THIS FORM:

EVENT DATE	EVENT TITLE EVENT LOCATION	NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS					
		TEACHERS	YOUTHS	DISTRICT ADMIN.	COMMUNITY PARTNERS/ PARENTS	ELECTED OFFICIALS	OTHER
	TOTALS						

Form D

Summary of Proposed Key Activities during 2006-09

☐ Developmental Partnership   ☐ Sustainable-Institutionalization Partnership

Local Educational Agency: _____

Please describe key activities/events that will occur in 2006-09. More detail is needed for 2006-07 and general milestones for 2007-09 Key Activities. Please limit this summary to two pages. You may submit this information in your own format if you prefer. Provide enough detail to help the application reviewers understand the general scope of key activities that are envisioned. Include key activities that will be implemented during the 2006-09 school year, such as in-service trainings, outreach activities to involve schools, parents, families, community members, private business, other Corporation for National Community Service grantees, or institutions of higher education.

KEY ACTIVITY DATES	KEY ACTIVITY DESCRIPTIONS	LEAD ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL	TARGET AUDIENCE (E.G., YOUTHS, TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, COMMUNITY PARTNERS, ELECTED OFFICIALS)

Form E

Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan

☐ Developmental Partnership (2006-07)   ☐ Sustainable–Institutionalization (SI) Partnership (2006-09)

Local Educational Agency: _____

Please use this form to develop a plan for evaluating each of the outcome indicators proposed for the application narrative sections. The form is created as a Microsoft Word document and will expand as you type into the blank section. Please see page 50-51 for definitions and explanations.

SECTION 1. VISION AND POLICY				
END-OUTCOME INDICATORS FOR YEAR THREE (BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS OR COMMUNITY)	DATA COLLECTION FROM OUTPUT INDICATORS (*RESULTS AND PRODUCTS*)	PERSONNEL	PROGRAM EVALUATION PROCESS	TIMELINE FOR 2006-07 OR 2006-09, INCLUDING TARGET DATES
Vision *** SI Applicants:** All students are provided with at least one service-learning experience at each grade span. *** Developmental Applicants:** At least 50% of all students are provided with at least one service-learning experience at each grade span.				
Policy *** SI Applicants:** Local board policies and administrative directives in support of institutionalizing service-learning are implemented and will sustain the program after the grant ends. *** Developmental Applicants:** Local board policies and administrative directives in support of institutionalizing service-learning are being proposed or established.				

* Statements are provided above, as indicated in the narrative

31

SECTION 2. HIGH-QUALITY SERVICE-LEARNING				
INTERMEDIATE-OUTCOME OR OUTPUT INDICATORS	DATA COLLECTION FROM OUTPUT INDICATORS (*RESULTS AND PRODUCTS)*	PERSONNEL	PROGRAM EVALUATION PROCESS	TIMELINE, INCLUDING TARGET DATES

SECTION 3. TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT				
INTERMEDIATE-OUTCOME OR OUTPUT INDICATORS	DATA COLLECTION FROM OUTPUT INDICATORS (*RESULTS AND PRODUCTS)*	PERSONNEL	PROGRAM EVALUATION PROCESS	TIMELINE, INCLUDING TARGET DATES

SECTION 4. ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGN AND LEADERSHIP CAPACITY				
INTERMEDIATE-OUTCOME OR OUTPUT INDICATORS	DATA COLLECTION FROM OUTPUT INDICATORS (*RESULTS AND PRODUCTS)*	PERSONNEL	PROGRAM EVALUATION PROCESS	TIMELINE, INCLUDING TARGET DATES

SECTION 5. RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC RELATIONS/RECOGNITION ACTIVITIES

INTERMEDIATE-OUTCOME OR OUTPUT INDICATORS	DATA COLLECTION FROM OUTPUT INDICATORS (*RESULTS AND PRODUCTS*)	PERSONNEL	PROGRAM EVALUATION PROCESS	TIMELINE, INCLUDING TARGET DATES

SECTION 6. EVALUATION, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND CONTINUOUS PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

INTERMEDIATE-OUTCOME OR OUTPUT INDICATORS	DATA COLLECTION FROM OUTPUT INDICATORS (*RESULTS AND PRODUCTS*)	PERSONNEL	PROGRAM EVALUATION PROCESS	TIMELINE, INCLUDING TARGET DATES

SECTION 7. INSTITUTIONALIZING AND SUSTAINING ORGANIZATION HIGH QUALITY SERVICE-LEARNING (SI APPLICANTS ONLY)

END-OUTCOME INDICATORS	DATA COLLECTION FROM OUTPUT INDICATORS (*RESULTS AND PRODUCTS*)	PERSONNEL	PROGRAM EVALUATION PROCESS	TIMELINE, INCLUDING TARGET DATES

Form F
CalServe Participant Data for 2005-06

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY (LEA):	COUNTY-DISTRICT CODE:

NAME AND TITLE OF PERSON COMPLETING THIS FORM:

In which setting does your partnership operate?
☐ **Rural**   ☐ **Suburban**   ☐ **Urban**   ☐ **Mixed**

Current and Projected Data

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS	CDS CODE	TOTAL SCHOOL ENROLLMENT	* % TITLE 1/SCE ENROLLMENT	INDICATE THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPATING STUDENTS FOR EACH YEAR	
				05-06 ACTUAL	06-07 PROJECTED

SCHOOL EMPLOYEES	TOTAL IN LEA 2005-06	INDICATE THE TOTAL NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES INVOLVED IN SERVICE-LEARNING FOR EACH YEAR	
		05-06 ACTUAL	06-07 PROJECTED
Teachers			
Administrators/School Board Members			
Other School Employees			
TOTAL SCHOOL EMPLOYEES			

Parents and/or family members	Total number of individuals involved in service-learning for each year	
	05-06 Actual	06-07 Projected
TOTAL PARENTS/FAMILY MEMBERS		

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES	Total number of individuals involved in service-learning for each year	
	05-06 ACTUAL	06-07 PROJECTED
Nonfaith-based community organizations		
Faith-based organizations		
Nonpublic K-12 schools		
Public agencies		
Businesses		
AmeriCorps members		
AmeriCorps VISTA		
Senior Corps (RSVP, foster grandparents, senior companion)		
Seniors and Youths Engaged in Service (SaYES)		
Other senior citizens		
Other community representatives		
Legislators and community officials		
TOTAL COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES		

* Title I is from federal No Child Left Behind legislation, and State Compensatory Education (SCE) is from state economic impact aid legislation.

Attachment A

Sustainable-Institutionalization Continuum for Service-Learning Partnerships

It is CalServe's goal that at the end of the year six grant cycle, all grantees will have institutionalized service-learning in their local educational agency (LEA). This Sustainable-Institutionalization Continuum will be used to score your partnership application.

☐ Developmental Partnership　　　　　　　　　　　　　　☐ Sustainable-Institutionalization Partnership

Check one of the boxes above.

SECTION 1. VISION AND POLICY

INSTITUTIONALIZED (4)	EXPANDING (3)	UNDERWAY (2)	GETTING STARTED (1)
1a. LEA support for Institutionalization The LEA has institutionalized service-learning across the LEA. There is very clear evidence of LEA support. Service-learning is included in the local LEA plan(s).	**1a. LEA support for Institutionalization** The LEA has an adequate short-term and long-term plan for sustaining and institutionalizing service-learning across the LEA. There is substantial evidence of LEA support.	**1a. LEA support for Institutionalization** The LEA has a minimal short-term and long-term plan for sustaining and institutionalizing service-learning across the LEA. There is limited evidence of LEA support.	**1a. LEA support for Institutionalization** The LEA has a limited or no plan for sustaining and institutionalizing service-learning across the LEA. There is minimal evidence of LEA support.
1b. Establish a Vision The LEA has achieved the long-term vision of having all students participate in at least one high-quality service-learning activity at each grade span.	**1b. Establish a Vision** The LEA has nearly achieved a long-term vision. Most grade levels, schools, or special programs have met the vision, and almost all service-learning activities are of high quality.	**1b. Establish a Vision** The LEA has a clear and detailed plan for achieving a long-term vision. Some grade levels, schools, or special programs are meeting the vision, and the quality of service-learning activities is well documented.	**1b. Establish a Vision** The LEA has broad-based support and has established a general plan to achieve a long-term vision. A specific program focus or a wide variety of service-learning activities is occurring across the LEA. The quality varies and is being monitored.

Attachment A

Sustainable-Institutionalization Continuum for Service-Learning Partnerships

SECTION 1. VISION AND POLICY - CONTINUED

INSTITUTIONALIZED (4)	EXPANDING (3)	UNDERWAY (2)	GETTING STARTED (1)
1d. School Board Policy Policy is in place and includes approval, support, and accountability for the institutionalization of service-learning.	**1d. School Board Policy** Current policy related to service-learning provides adequate support and accountability toward institutionalization. The partnership has clearly identified next year's policy outcomes, including institutionalization.	**1d. School Board Policy** Policy related to service-learning is limited and may be at an administrative level only. The partnership has limited policy outcomes toward institutionalization for next year.	**1d. School Board Policy** Policy to support service-learning is included in one program area or not at all. The partnership has unclear or no policy outcomes for next year. Institutionalization plans are not described.
1e. Major Milestones Landmarks are very clearly described for year one.	**1e. Major Milestones** Landmarks are adequately described for year one.	**1e. Major Milestones** Landmarks are described at a limited level for year one.	**1e. Major Milestones** A description of landmarks is unclear or is missing for year one.
1f. Performance Measures Very clear and measurable performance measures are identified on Form E.	**1f. Performance Measures** Adequate, relevant, and measurable performance measures are identified on Form E.	**1f. Performance Measures** Limited performance measures are identified on Form E.	**1f. Performance Measures** Minimal or unclear performance measures are identified on Form E.

Attachment A

Sustainable-Institutionalization Continuum for Service-Learning Partnerships

SECTION 2. HIGH-QUALITY SERVICE-LEARNING

INSTITUTIONALIZED (4)	EXPANDING (3)	UNDERWAY (2)	GETTING STARTED (1)
2a. High-Quality Service-Learning The partnership has integrated service-learning into its instructional practice, fully aligned with the five elements of the federal definition for service-learning. There is very clear evidence that the service activities are linked to the state-adopted academic content standards, including civics. It is very evident that young people had a strong voice in determining the community needs and service activities that will include at least 20 hours per semester of service-learning experience for each participating student. Funding to maintain service-learning is in place for the future.	**2a. High-Quality Service-Learning** An adequate service-learning instructional design process, aligned with the five elements of the federal definition for service-learning, is described. There is adequate evidence that service activities are linked to the state-adopted academic content standards. Young people have had an adequate voice in determining the community needs and service activities that include at least 20 hours per semester of service-learning experience for each participating student. Funding to maintain service-learning is planned for the future.	**2a. High-Quality Service-Learning** A limited instructional design, with service-learning activities somewhat aligned with the federal definition for service-learning, is described. There is limited evidence that service activities are linked to the state content standards. The role of young people in determining the community needs and service activities is very limited or is unclear. There is a limited decision to include at least 20 hours per semester of service-learning experience. Funding to maintain service-learning is limited for the future.	**2a. High-Quality Service-Learning** The instructional design process is not aligned with the federal definition for service-learning or is aligned in a minimal way or not at all. There is minimal evidence that service activities are linked to the state content standards. The role of young people in determining the community needs and service activities is very unclear or missing. There is no plan to include at least 20 hours per semester of each service-learning experience. Funding to maintain service-learning is minimal for the future.

Attachment A

Sustainable-Institutionalization Continuum for Service-Learning Partnerships

SECTION 2. HIGH-QUALITY SERVICE-LEARNING - CONTINUED

INSTITUTIONALIZED (4)	EXPANDING (3)	UNDERWAY (2)	GETTING STARTED (1)
2b. Student Assessment Students are assessed on the achievement of state content standards as they participate in service activities. A very clear description of how the partnership will determine the increase in students' sense of civic responsibility is presented. There is clear evidence of asset-building strategies supporting and empowering youths.	**2b. Student Assessment** There is an adequate description of how students will be assessed on the achievement of state content standards as they participate in service activities. An adequate description of how the partnership will determine the increase in students' sense of civic responsibility is presented. There is some evidence of asset-building strategies supporting and empowering youths.	**2b. Student Assessment** There is a limited description of how students will be assessed on the achievement of state content standards as they participate in service activities. A limited description of how the partnership will determine the increase in students' sense of civic responsibility is presented. There is limited evidence of asset-building strategies supporting and empowering youths.	**2b. Student Assessment** There is a minimal or no description of how students will be assessed on the achievement of state content standards as they participate in service activities. A minimal description or none at all of how the partnership will determine the increase in students' sense of civic responsibility is presented. There is minimal evidence of asset-building strategies supporting and empowering youths.
2c. Youth Voice A very clear description of how students are determining community needs and high-quality service-learning.	**2c. Youth Voice** There is an adequate description of how students participated in determining community needs and high-quality service-learning.	**2c. Youth Voice** There is a limited description of how students participated in determining community needs and high-quality service-learning.	**2c. Youth Voice** There is a minimal or no description of how students participated in determining community needs and high-quality service-learning.
2d. Student Participation Opportunities for students from nonpublic schools and diverse groups are included in the initiative. It is clear that students from different grade spans work together.	**2d. Student Participation** Opportunities for students from nonpublic schools and diverse groups are adequately described. Students from different grade spans adequately work together.	**2d. Student Participation** Limited opportunities for students from nonpublic schools and diverse groups are listed. Students from different grade spans work together in service-learning in a limited way.	**2d. Student Participation** Minimal or no opportunities for students from nonpublic schools and diverse groups are included. Students from different grade spans do not work together or do not receive service-learning opportunities.

Attachment A

Sustainable-Institutionalization Continuum for Service-Learning Partnerships

SECTION 2. HIGH-QUALITY SERVICE-LEARNING – CONTINUED

INSTITUTIONALIZED (4)	EXPANDING (3)	UNDERWAY (2)	GETTING STARTED (1)
2e. Engaging Disadvantaged Youths Strategies for engaging disadvantaged youths are clearly described. The strategies are very effective in engaging substantially increased numbers of disadvantaged youths in service-learning.	**2e. Engaging Disadvantaged Youths** Adequate strategies for engaging disadvantaged youths are described. The strategies described are adequate in engaging more disadvantaged youths in service-learning.	**2e. Engaging Disadvantaged Youths** Limited or unclear strategies for engaging and/or serving disadvantaged youths are listed. The strategies described are limited in engaging disadvantaged youths in service-learning.	**2e. Engaging Disadvantaged Youths** There is minimal or no opportunities for disadvantaged youths to engage in service-learning. The strategies described are having minimal or no effect in engaging disadvantaged youths in service-learning.
2f. Diversity Clear evidence is provided that the initiative includes opportunities for students from public and nonpublic schools and from diverse groups as to age, race, gender, ethnicity, ability, and economic background to serve and study together.	**2f. Diversity** There is adequate evidence that the initiative includes opportunities for students from public and nonpublic schools and from diverse groups as to age, race, gender, ethnicity, ability, and economic background to serve and study together.	**2f. Diversity** There is limited evidence that the initiative includes opportunities for students from public and nonpublic schools and from diverse groups as to age, race, gender, ethnicity, ability, and economic background to serve and study together.	**2f. Diversity** Unclear or no evidence is provided that the initiative includes opportunities for students from public and nonpublic schools and from diverse groups as to age, race, gender, ethnicity, ability, and economic background to serve and study together.
2g. Performance Measures Very clear and measurable performance measures are identified on Form E.	**2g. Performance Measures** Adequate, relevant, and measurable performance measures are identified on Form E.	**2g. Performance Measures** Limited performance measures are identified on Form E.	**2g. Performance Measures** Minimal or unclear performance measures are identified on Form E.

Attachment A

Sustainable-Institutionalization Continuum for Service-Learning Partnerships

SECTION 3. TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

INSTITUTIONALIZED (4)	EXPANDING (3)	UNDERWAY (2)	GETTING STARTED (1)
3a. Training Needs and Strengths The assessment of needs and strengths for service-learning training and professional development is integrated into the LEA's overall professional development plans. Key areas of need and strength, particularly those related to teaching to the LEA/state standards are well-identified for all stakeholders. The Training and Professional Development Plan demonstrates that nonpublic school teachers are attending. Funding for the training and development is in place for the future.	**3a. Training Needs and Strengths** The assessment of needs and strengths for service-learning training and professional development is adequately integrated into the LEA's overall professional development plans. Key areas of need and strength, particularly those related to teaching to the LEA/state standards are adequately identified for all stakeholders. The Training and Professional Development Plan includes opportunities for nonpublic school teachers to attend. Funding for training and development is planned for the future.	**3a. Training Needs and Strengths** The assessment of needs and strengths for service-learning training and professional development is limited. Areas of need and strength, particularly those related to teaching to the LEA/state standards, are listed for some stakeholders. The Training and Professional Development Plan includes opportunities nonpublic school teachers to attend. Funding for training and development is limited for the future.	**3a. Training Needs and Strengths** The assessment of needs and strengths for service-learning training and professional development is minimally integrated into the LEA's overall professional development plans. Limited areas of need and strength related to teaching to the LEA/state standards are identified. The Training and Professional Development Plan does not include opportunities for nonpublic school teachers to attend. Funding for the training and development is minimal.
3b. Stakeholders There is clear evidence that youths, parents, and community partners are making decisions in planning training and professional development.	**3b. Stakeholders** There is adequate evidence that youths, parents, and community partners have been involved in the planning of training and professional development.	**3b. Stakeholders** Limited evidence of youths, parents, and community partners as planners is provided.	**3b. Stakeholders** Evidence of youths, parents, and community partners' involvement in next year's plan is nonexistent or minimal.

Attachment A

Sustainable-Institutionalization Continuum for Service-Learning Partnerships

SECTION 3. TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT – CONTINUED

INSTITUTIONALIZED (4)	EXPANDING (3)	UNDERWAY (2)	GETTING STARTED (1)
3c. Training and Professional Development Plan A comprehensive training and professional development plan based on the needs assessment is well established. Professional development activities (Form C) very clearly address the key needs. Service-learning is fully infused into most other school and LEA training events and includes youths, parents, and community members.	**3c. Training and Professional Development Plan** An adequate training and professional development plan is based on the needs assessment. Professional development activities (Form C) adequately address the key needs. Service-learning is infused into many other school and LEA training events.	**3c. Training and Professional Development Plan** The training and professional development plan is based on the needs assessment in a limited way. Professional development activities (Form C) are limited. Service-learning is sometimes included in other school and LEA training events.	**3c. Training and Professional Development Plan** A training and professional development plan is minimally established. Professional development activities (Form C) are missing or minimally list the key needs. Service-learning is minimally included into other school and LEA training events.
3d. Performance Measures Very clear and measurable performance measures are identified on Form E.	**3d. Performance Measures** Adequate, relevant, and measurable performance measures are identified on Form E.	**3d. Performance Measures** Limited performance measures are identified on Form E.	**3d. Performance Measures** Minimal or unclear performance measures are identified on Form E.

Attachment A

Sustainable-Institutionalization Continuum for Service-Learning Partnerships

SECTION 4. ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGN AND LEADERSHIP CAPACITY

INSTITUTIONALIZED (4)	EXPANDING (3)	UNDERWAY (2)	GETTING STARTED (1)
4a. Organizational Design Form D indicates a comprehensive number of partnership participants will be engaged in service-learning activities. An experienced and highly qualified program coordinator is in place. Funding for the service-learning coordinator is in place for the future.	**4a. Organizational Design** Form D indicates an adequate number of partnership participants will be engaged in service-learning activities. An adequately experienced program coordinator is identified. Funding the service-learning coordinator is planned for the future.	**4a. Organizational Design** Form D indicates a limited number of partnership participants who will be engaged in service-learning activities. A program coordinator with limited experience is identified and funding for the coordinator is unclear.	**4a. Organizational Design** Form D indicates a minimal number or lack of partnership participants who will be engaged in service-learning activities. No program coordinator or one with minimal or no experience is identified. There is no funding for the coordinator.
4b. Advisory Committee and Youth Voice The partnership's advisory committee has provided leadership, support, and resources. Youth leadership is clearly defined, and there is evidence that there is active youths' participation in this application.	**4b. Advisory Committee and Youth Voice** The partnership's advisory committee has provided adequate leadership, support, and resources. Youth leadership is evident but not clearly defined. Youth leadership is well defined and there is evidence that there is youth voice.	**4b. Advisory Committee and Youth Voice** The partnership's advisory committee has limited or emerging leadership, support, and resources. Youth leadership is not clearly defined. It is unclear how youths participated in this application.	**4b. Advisory Committee and Youth Voice** The partnership's advisory committee has minimal leadership, support, and resources. Youth leadership is minimal. There is little evidence of youths' voice in completing this application.

Attachment A

Sustainable-Institutionalization Continuum for Service-Learning Partnerships

SECTION 4. ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGN AND LEADERSHIP CAPACITY - CONTINUED

INSTITUTIONALIZED (4)	EXPANDING (3)	UNDERWAY (2)	GETTING STARTED (1)
4c. Leadership Capacity Organizations and agencies assigned representatives to make up the partnership's advisory committee. The LEA, administration, and youths have clear leadership roles. All advisory committee members actively participate in the design, support, implementation, and accountability of the partnership. Plans for replicability are already in place.	**4b. Leadership Capacity** An adequate number of organizations and agencies have assigned representatives to the partnership's advisory committee. The LEA, administration, and youths have adequate leadership roles. Most advisory committee members actively participate in the design, support, implementation, and accountability of the partnership. Plans for replicability are adequate but not in place.	**4c. Leadership Capacity** A limited number of organization and agency representatives make up the partnership's advisory committee. The LEA, administration, and youths have limited leadership roles. A limited number of advisory committee members actively participate in the design, support, implementation, and accountability of the partnership. Plans for replicability are limited and not in place.	**4c. Leadership Capacity** Minimal organizations and agencies are included in the partnership's advisory committee. The LEA, administration, and youths have limited leadership roles. A minimal number of advisory committee members participate in the design, support, implementation, and accountability of the partnership. Plans for replicability are minimal.
4d. Performance Measures Very clear and measurable performance measures are identified on Form E.	**4d. Performance Measures** Adequate, relevant, and measurable performance measures are identified on Form E.	**4d. Performance Measures** Limited performance measures are identified on Form E.	**4d. Performance Measures** Minimal or unclear performance measures are identified on Form E.

Attachment A

Sustainable-Institutionalization Continuum for Service-Learning Partnerships

SECTION 5. RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC RELATIONS/RECOGNITION ACTIVITIES

INSTITUTIONALIZED (4)	EXPANDING (3)	UNDERWAY (2)	GETTING STARTED (1)
5a. Funding and Resources There are comprehensive funding strategies in addition to the CalServe grant, supporting the service-learning initiative. Existing school and community funding and resources that will support a very viable service-learning initiative in the partnership are in place. Memoranda of Understanding or partnership agreements clearly provide evidence of the specific cash and in-kind resources and organizational commitments to the partnership to support high-quality service-learning, training and professional development, and the program coordinator. Definitive linkages to other initiatives in the partnership have clearly reduced reliance on CalServe funding over time.	**5a. Funding and Resources** There is an adequate funding strategy, in addition to the CalServe grant, supporting the service-learning initiative. Existing school and community funding and resources that will support a service-learning initiative in the partnership are in place. Memoranda of Understanding or partnership agreements adequately provide evidence of the specific cash and in-kind resources and organizational commitments to the partnership to support high-quality service-learning, training and professional development, and the program coordinator. Linkages to other initiatives in the partnership have reduced reliance on CalServe funding over time.	**5a. Funding and Resources** There are limited funding strategies, in addition to the CalServe grant, supporting the service-learning initiative. Support from school and community funding and resources is unclear. Memoranda of Understanding or partnership agreements provide limited evidence of specific cash and in-kind resources and organizational commitments to the partnership to support high-quality service-learning, training and professional development, and the program coordinator. Some linkages to other initiatives exist in the partnership plan to reduce reliance on CalServe funding over time.	**5a. Funding and Resources** There is little or no description of funding strategies. Minimal school and community funding and resources that will support a service-learning initiative are in place. Memoranda of Understanding or partnership agreements minimally provide evidence of cash and in-kind resources and organizational commitments to the partnership to support high-quality service-learning, training and professional development, and the program coordinator. Linkages to other initiatives in the partnership have minimal plans to reduce reliance on CalServe funding over time.

Attachment A

Sustainable-Institutionalization Continuum for Service-Learning Partnerships

SECTION 5. RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC RELATIONS/RECOGNITION ACTIVITIES - CONTINUED

INSTITUTIONALIZED (4)	EXPANDING (3)	UNDERWAY (2)	GETTING STARTED (1)
5b. Public Relations/Recognition Plan A comprehensive public relations and marketing strategy is present. As part of the public relations strategy, recognition activities for all participants (youths and adults from school and community) are clearly evident. Clear, viable strategies to educate local, state, and national elected officials about service-learning are occurring to promote institutionalization of the service-learning initiative.	**5b. Public Relations/Recognition Plan** An adequate marketing and public relations strategy to support the partnership is present. As part of the public relation strategy, recognition activities for nearly all participants (youths and adults from school and community) are described. Adequate strategies to educate local, state, and national elected officials about service-learning are occurring to promote institutionalization of the service-learning initiative.	**5b. Public Relations/Recognition Plan** As part of the marketing and public relations strategy, recognition activities for a limited number of participants (youths and adults from school and community) are briefly described. Limited strategies to educate local, state, and national elected officials about service-learning are occurring to promote institutionalization of the service-learning initiative.	**5b. Public Relations/Recognition Plan** Minimal or no marketing or public relations strategy to support the partnership is present. If there is a public relation strategy, recognition activities for very few participants (youths and adults from school and community) are described. Strategies to educate local, state, and national elected officials about service-learning are missing. There is no plan to promote institutionalization of the service-learning initiative.
5c. Linkages to Other Programs There are clearly defined programmatic linkages among the service-learning initiative community partners and other initiatives and other local, state, and federal categorical programs (e.g., No Child Left Behind Act of 2001) operating in the partnership. A clear plan is in place to serve disadvantaged youths.	**5c. Linkages to Other Programs** The partnership is an adequate collaborative between the LEA and a variety of community partners. There are adequately defined programmatic linkages between the service-learning initiative and other initiatives and other local, state, and federal categorical programs (e.g., No Child Left Behind Act of 2001) operating in the partnership. An adequate plan is in place to serve disadvantaged youths.	**5c. Linkages to Other Programs** The partnership is a limited collaborative between the LEA and a few community partners. There are limitedly defined programmatic linkages between the service-learning initiative and other initiatives and other local, state, and federal categorical programs (e.g., No Child Left Behind Act of 2001). A limited plan is in place to serve disadvantaged youths.	**5c. Linkages to Other Programs** The partnership is not a collaborative between the LEA and community partners. There are no clearly defined programmatic linkages between the service-learning initiative and other initiatives and other local, state, and federal categorical programs (e.g., No Child Left Behind Act of 2001). There are no plans to serve disadvantaged youths.

Attachment A

Sustainable-Institutionalization Continuum for Service-Learning Partnerships

SECTION 5. RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC RELATIONS/RECOGNITION ACTIVITIES – CONTINUED

5d. Performance Measures Very clear and measurable performance measures are identified on Form E.	**5d. Performance Measures** Adequate, relevant, and measurable performance measures are identified on Form E.	**5d. Performance Measures** Limited performance measures are identified on Form E.	**5d. Performance Measures –** Minimal or unclear performance measures are identified on Form E.

Attachment A

Sustainable-Institutionalization Continuum for Service-Learning Partnerships

SECTION 6 – EVALUATION, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND CONTINUOUS PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

INSTITUTIONALIZED (4)	EXPANDING (3)	UNDERWAY (2)	GETTING STARTED (1)
6a. Local Evaluation Team The local evaluation team has very clearly identified roles and is made up of LEA representatives, community practitioners, and youths.	**6a. Local Evaluation Team** The local evaluation team has adequately identified roles and is made up of LEA representatives, community practitioners, and youths.	**6a. Local Evaluation Team** The local evaluation team has been identified and is made up of LEA representatives, community practitioners, and youths.	**6a. Local Evaluation Team** The local evaluation team has not been identified or is made up of practitioners with minimal or no evaluation qualifications. Roles are unclear.
6b. Evaluation Plan for Outcomes A very clear evaluation plan describing the methods and kinds of evidence, strategies, and personnel involved in evaluating outcome indicators is presented. Linkages to established LEA and/or community evaluation mechanisms are clearly described and funded.	**6b. Evaluation Plan for Outcomes** An adequate evaluation plan describing the methods and kinds of evidence, strategies, and personnel involved in evaluating the outcome indicators is presented. Linkages to established evaluation mechanisms are adequately described and funded.	**6b. Evaluation Plan for Outcomes** A limited evaluation plan describing the methods and kinds of evidence, strategies, and personnel involved in evaluating the outcome indicators is presented. Some limited linkages to established evaluation mechanisms are described and funded.	**6b. Evaluation Plan for Outcomes** A minimal evaluation plan describing the methods and kinds of evidence, strategies, and personnel involved in evaluating the narrative outcome indicators is presented. Minimal or no linkages to established evaluation mechanisms are described and funded.

Attachment A

Sustainable-Institutionalization Continuum for Service-Learning Partnerships

SECTION 6 – EVALUATION, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND CONTINUOUS PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

INSTITUTIONALIZED (4)	EXPANDING (3)	UNDERWAY (2)	GETTING STARTED (1)
6c. Monitoring Progress Clear evidence is provided on how the evaluation data from 2004-06 have been used to improve the quality of service-learning, inform LEA policy, and garner support for sustainable-institutionalization. A clear plan for the use of the 2006-09 local evaluation is also described.	**6c. Monitoring Progress** Adequate evidence is provided on how the evaluation data from 2004-06 have been used to improve the quality of service-learning, inform LEA policy, and garner support for sustainable-institutionalization. An adequate plan for the use of the 2006-09 local evaluation is also described.	**6c. Monitoring Progress** Limited evidence is provided on how the evaluation data from prior years have been used to improve the quality of service-learning, inform LEA policy, and garner support for sustainable-institutionalization. A limited plan for the use of the 2006-09 local evaluation is also described.	**6c. Monitoring Progress** Minimal or no evidence is provided on how data have been collected or used to improve the quality of service-learning, inform LEA policy, and garner support for sustainable-institutionalization. The plan for the use of the 2006-09 local evaluation is missing or minimal.
6d. Performance Measures Very clear and measurable performance measures are identified on Form E.	**6d. Performance Measures** Adequate, relevant, and measurable performance measures are identified on Form E.	**6d. Performance Measures** Limited performance measures are identified on Form E.	**6d. Performance Measures** Minimal or unclear performance measures are identified on Form E.

48

Attachment A

Sustainable-Institutionalization Continuum for Service-Learning Partnerships

SECTION 7. INSTITUTIONALIZING AND SUSTAINING HIGH-QUALITY SERVICE-LEARNING
(FOR SUSTAINABLE-INSTITUTIONALIZATION PARTNERSHIP APPLICANTS ONLY)

INSTITUTIONALIZED (4)	EXPANDING (3)	UNDERWAY (2)	GETTING STARTED (1)
7a. Sustainable-Institutionalization There is a clear description of how high-quality service-learning will become institutionalized. The application provides clear details of how the LEA will sustain the program after the grant ends by providing fiscal support for a coordinator, ongoing professional development, and extending service-learning to all schools at each grade span.	**7a. Sustainable-Institutionalization** There is an adequate description of how high-quality service-learning will become institutionalized. The application provides adequate details of how the LEA will sustain the program after the grant ends by providing fiscal support for a coordinator, ongoing professional development, and extending service-learning to all schools at each grade span.	**7a. Sustainable-Institutionalization** There is limited description of how high-quality service-learning will become institutionalized The application provides limited details of how the LEA will sustain the program after the grant ends by providing fiscal support for a coordinator, ongoing professional development, and extending service-learning to all schools at each grade span.	**7a. Sustainable-Institutionalization** There is minimal description of how high-quality service-learning will become institutionalized. The application provides little or no details of how the LEA will sustain the program after the grant ends by providing fiscal support for a coordinator, ongoing professional development, and extending service-learning to all schools at each grade span.
7b. Performance Measures Very clear and measurable performance measures are identified on Form E.	**7b. Performance Measures** Adequate, relevant, and measurable performance measures are identified on Form E.	**7b. Performance Measures** Limited performance measures are identified on Form E.	**7b. Performance Measures** Minimal or unclear performance measures are identified on Form E.

CalServe Developmental and Sustainable-Institutionalization Partnership

Service-learning initiative grantees are accountable based on their ability to accomplish specific performance measures. All Partnership grantees are required to develop a system for collecting, organizing, and reporting performance data on an ongoing basis.

Indicators describe a range of products or services and benefits. They are as follows:
- ✓ Output Indicators - quantitative results or amount of product (year one, two and three)
- ✓ Intermediate-Outcome Indicators - short-term benefits or changes for participants or beneficiaries, (year one and/or two)
- ✓ End-Outcome Indicator - long-term changes that have occurred for students, schools, the LEA, and the community, (year three)

The Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS) and Learn and Serve America, have taken a strong interest in performance-measured accountability. As such, they will hold grantees (e.g., the California Department of Education [CDE], CalServe Initiative) accountable based on our ability to accomplish specific performance measures. These measures are developed by the grantees (CDE and our grantees) and are data driven. Therefore, CalServe will require 2006-09 Developmental Partnership grantees to develop a system for collecting, organizing, and reporting performance data on an ongoing basis.

The CalServe Developmental Request for Application has incorporated the use of the CNCS performance measure accountability system. Performance measures are divided into three kinds of "indicators." Indicators describe a range of products or services and benefits associated with designing, supporting, and implementing high-quality service-learning activities.

"Output" indicators describe the quantitative results rather than the resulting benefits of the service-learning project or other related activities. These deliverables are things such as the number of trees planted, books read, students involved, or people helped. Output indicators may also describe the number of reflections written, teachers trained, or reports written. Applicants will describe their output indicators using Form E (Key Program Outcomes and Local Evaluation Plan).

The second kind of indicator is an "outcome" indicator, and it describes the resulting benefits of a product or service (output). There are two kinds of outcome indicators: "intermediate" outcome indicators and "end" outcome indicators. Intermediate-outcome indicators describe the short-term benefits or changes for participants or beneficiaries, but they do not describe the results of the long-term vision of the partnership. Examples of intermediate outcome indicators might include knowledge or skills gained, increased satisfaction with teaching, improved school and district support, improved school-community relations, and beneficiary satisfaction. Applicants will state the intermediate outcome indicators they have selected in the program narrative. End outcome indicators

describe the long-term changes that have occurred for students, schools and the district, and the community. Examples might include three-year vision achieved, policy implemented with associated benefits reported, or community quality of life improved.

Below is an example of output indicators and intermediate outcome indicators performance measures for students, teachers, schools and districts, and the community for Section 2, High-Quality Service-Learning (Form E).

Audience	Activities	Output Indicators *(Results / Products)*	Intermediate-Outcome Indicators *(Benefits to Participants and Community)*
Students	-Plan and implement service-learning activities	-Trees planted -Students participating -Presentations made -Tests taken	-Academic knowledge and skills gained -Civic responsibility and ethic of service gained
Teachers	-Training event held	-Teachers trained	-Knowledge and skills gained
School and District	-Advisory meetings held -Board presentations made	-Plans developed -Policy approved	-Leadership for service-learning gained -Support for service-learning gained
Community	-Training event held -Support for service activity gained	-Partners trained -Service placements made	-Knowledge gained about service-learning -Community relations improved

ATTACHMENT C:

2000-2006 CALSERVE GRANTEES

The following school districts received Learn and Serve America grants in the last six years and are ineligible for this round of developmental funding.

Acalanes Union High School District
Beverly Hills Unified School District
Burbank Unified School District
California Education Authority
Carpinteria Unified School District
Chico Unified School District
Del Norte County Unified School District
Galt Joint Union Elementary School District
Kings Canyon Joint Unified School District
Lompoc Unified School District
Los Angeles Unified School District B, San Fernando (District 1)
Los Angeles Unified School Districts A & C (District 2)
Mendocino Unified School District
Millville Elementary School District
Moorpark Unified School District
Ojai Unified School District
Orange County Department of Education
Orange County Department of Education - ACCESS
Palo Alto Unified School District
Rim of the World Unified School District
Riverdale Joint Unified School District
San Jose Unified School District
Tahoe-Truckee Unified School District
West Sonoma County Union High School District